

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (US 2005/0009578) in view of Van Kampen (US 2005/0136914).

Response:

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to distinguish from the cited prior art. The applicant will explain below how the currently amended claims 1 and 12 distinguish from the prior art.

In the present invention, as shown in Figures 4 and 5, the access point will notify a station through a MORE DATA BIT that more data is about to be delivered within a predetermined period of time. Because more data is being delivered, the station will remain in active mode, and will not enter the power saving mode. Thus, as soon as the access point has data that is ready to be delivered to the station, the access point is able to deliver the data since the station is awake. This allows the station to receive the data as soon as possible.

To describe this feature, claims 1 and 12 have been amended to state that after the access point receives a first fragment to be delivered to the station, the access point immediately delivers the first fragment to the station in response to the access point receiving the first fragment. Then, if a period between the first beacon and a second fragment of the plurality of fragments received by the station after the first beacon is smaller than a predetermined time, a MORE DATA BIT is set as enabled and the station is in an active mode. On the other hand, if a period between the first beacon and a second fragment of the plurality of fragments received by the station

after the first beacon is not smaller than a predetermined time, the MORE DATA BIT is set as disabled and the station is in a power saving mode.

5 In contrast, Liu teaches that data is buffered until the station wakes up. As mentioned in paragraphs [0028] and [0055] of Liu, the stations will only awake during certain beacon periods. During the time when the station is not awake, the access point will store the station's data traffic in a buffer until a beacon interval when the station is awake. Once the station is awake, the access point will deliver the buffered traffic to the station. Therefore, Liu does not deliver data to the station
10 as soon as the access point receives data to be delivered to the station, as is claimed in the currently amended claims 1 and 12. Therefore, claims 1 and 12 are patentably distinct from the cited prior art references.

15 In addition, claims 2, 3, 6, 9, and 11 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11, and 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

20 Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (US 2005/0009578) in view of Van Kampen (US 2005/0136914), and further in view of Stephens (US 2005/0068895).

Response:

25 Claim 7 recites the step of "sending the plurality of fragments to a single-packet MAC buffer". The applicant submits that the Liu and Stephens cannot be combined to teach this limitation.

As stated above with respect to claims 1 and 12, Liu requires traffic to be

buffered until the station wakes up. Because all traffic must be buffered until the station wakes up, a single-packet MAC buffer cannot be used for storing all of the buffered traffic since it is not large enough to store all of the traffic that may arrive before the station wakes up again. Therefore, the applicant submits that one skilled
5 in the art would not be inclined to combine the teachings of Liu and Stephens for provide the method recited in claim 7.

Furthermore, claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 13-15 are dependent on claims 1 and 12, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 12 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 4, 5, 7,
10 8, and 13-15 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (US 2005/0009578) in view of Van Kampen (US 2005/0136914) and further in view of
15 Kubler (US 5,726,984).

Response:

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 10 is therefore respectfully requested.
20

4. Rejection of claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (US 2005/0009578) in view of Van Kampen (US 2005/0136914) and further in view of Amada (US 5,559,804).
25

Response:


Claims 16 and 17 are dependent on claim 12, and should be allowed if claim 12 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 16 and 17 is therefore respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/711,409
Amdt. dated August 22, 2007
Reply to Office action of May 23, 2007

In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of patentability,
the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this
case.

5

Sincerely yours,



Date: 08.22.2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

10 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

15 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.
is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)